

REMARKS

Claims 1-60 were pending in the application. Claims 5, 20, 35, and 50 have been cancelled. Claims 1-2, 6-9, 11-12, 16-17, 21-24, 26-27, 31-32, 36-39, 41-42, 46-47, 51-54, and 56-57 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-4, 6-19, 21-34, 36-49, and 51-60 are pending in the application.

The Examiner objected to the specification. Applicant has amended the specification to overcome this objection.

The Examiner objected to the drawings. Applicant has corrected the drawings to overcome this objection.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1-6, 8, 11-21, 23, 26-36, 38, 41-51, 53, 56-60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hong et al. (U.S. Patent Re. 30,187). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Hong teaches “generating new first and second redundancy signals from digital data signals read from said record member...comparing said new first and second redundancy signals with first and second redundancy signals read from said record member and generating an error location signal from said comparison showing that such error, if any, is in a given group of signals and error pattern signals showing which signals in such group are in error; and changing the signals in error.” (Hong, Column 36, Line 62 – Column 37, Line 6)

Despite these teachings of Hong, Applicant respectfully submits that Hong fails to teach or suggest “in response to an indication of a data integrity error in at least one of the plurality of data blocks, determining whether the vertical redundant relationship between each of the remaining data blocks and the corresponding checksums indicates an error; and determining whether the horizontal

redundant relationship between the plurality of data blocks indicates an error” as recited in claim 1. In accordance, claim 1 is believed to patentably distinguish over Hong.

Claims 2-4, 6, 8, and 11-15 depend on claim 1 and are therefore believed to patentably distinguish over Hong for at least the reasons given above.

Also, Claim 31 recites features similar to those highlighted above with regard to independent claim 1 and is therefore believed to patentably distinguish over Hong for at least the reasons given in the above paragraphs discussing claim 1. Claims 32-34, 36, 38, and 41-45 depend on claim 31 and are therefore believed to patentably distinguish over Hong for the same reasons.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that Hong fails to teach or suggest “a storage array comprising a plurality of storage devices” and “each data block stored on one of the plurality of storage devices” and “wherein said array manager is configured such that in response to an indication of a data integrity error in at least one of the plurality of data blocks, said array manager determines whether the vertical redundant relationship between each of the remaining data blocks and the corresponding checksums indicates an error; wherein the array manager further determines whether the horizontal redundant relationship between the plurality of data blocks indicates an error” as recited in claim 16. In accordance, claim 16 is believed to patentably distinguish over Hong.

Claims 17-19, 21, 23, and 26-30 depend on claim 16 and are therefore believed to patentably distinguish over Hong for at least the reasons given above.

Also, Claim 46 recites features similar to those highlighted above with regard to independent claim 16 and is therefore believed to patentably distinguish over Hong for at least the reasons given in the above paragraphs discussing claim 16. Claims 47-49, 51, 53, and 56-60 depend on claim 46 and are therefore believed to patentably distinguish over Hong for the same reasons.

Furthermore, Claims 7, 9, 22, 24, 37, 39, 52, and 54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hong in view of Iwatani (U.S. Patent 6,023,780). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Applicant believes claims 7 and 9, claims 22 and 24, claims 37 and 39, and claims 52 and 54 are allowable as dependent on claims 1, 16, 31, and 46, respectively, which are believed allowable for at least the above stated reasons.

Claims 10, 25, 40 and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hong in view of Ng et al. (U.S. Patent Re. 36,846). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Applicant believes claims 10, 25, 40 and 55 are allowable as dependent on claims 1, 16, 31, and 46, respectively, which are believed allowable for at least the above stated reasons.

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If a phone interview would speed allowance of any pending claims, such is requested at the Examiner's convenience.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-76700/BNK.

Respectfully submitted,



B. Noël Kivlin
Reg. No. 33,929
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, Texas 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800
Date: 3-1-04